

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 19 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-30 are pending with claims 16-18 and 21-30 being withdrawn from further consideration.

The Examiner objected to the drawings since features of claim 7 are not shown in the drawings. Claim 7 has been canceled.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claim 7 has been canceled. Thus, the rejection is moot.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The claim has been carefully reviewed and revised bearing in mind the Examiner's rejection. It is respectfully submitted that all claims are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-9, 13-15, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by D'Arrigo. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended to define the invention more clearly and thus, obviate the rejection. In particular, claim 1 as amended recites an armature having a first portion disposed in the recess of the sleeve and a second portion extending outwardly from the first end of the sleeve. With regard to claim 19, the claim as amended recites that the first armature end includes an outer surface extending outwardly from the first sleeve end. In D'Arrigo, the armature 200 is entirely in recess 108. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-9, 13-15, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dallmeyer et al. With regard to claim 1 as amended, the claim recites that the armature has a second portion extending outwardly from the first end of the sleeve with the second portion having an outer perimeter a second distance from the longitudinal axis, the second distance not greater than the first distance. In Dallmeyer, the outer diameter (second distance) of the portion 262 of the armature extending from the sleeve is greater than the outer diameter of the sleeve (first distance).

With regard to claim 19, the claim as amended recites that the armature end includes an outer surface extending outwardly from the first sleeve end and being spaced apart from the inner surface of the coil assembly to provide an unobstructed

working gap between the outer surface and the inner surface. This is shown clearly in FIG. 1 of the specification. In Dallmeyer et al., there is a shell 230 about the portion 262 of the armature. Thus, any gap between the armature portion 262 and coil is obstructed. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dallmeyer et al. This claim depends from claim 1 and is considered to be allowable for the reasons advanced above with regard to claim 1 and, for the additional reason, that the added subject matter thereof is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arrigo in view of Dallmeyer et al. These claims depend from claim 1 and are considered to be allowable for the reasons advanced above with regard to claim 1 and, for the additional reason, that the added subject matter thereof is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Stemberger
Registration No. 36,017
Attorney for Applicant
Tel. No. (202) 261-1014

April 7, 2008

Customer No. 75227